

The Evolution of the Galaxy Cluster Luminosity-Temperature Relation

Megan C. Novicki

*University of Hawaii, Institute for Astronomy, 2680 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, HI, 96822
USA*

Manuela Sornig

Erzherzog-Johann Universitaet, Rechbauerstrasse 12, A-8010, Graz, Austria

J. Patrick Henry

*University of Hawaii, Institute for Astronomy, 2680 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, HI, 96822
USA*

ABSTRACT

We analyzed the luminosity-temperature (L-T) relation for 2 samples of galaxy clusters which have all been observed by the *ASCA* satellite. We used 32 high redshift clusters ($0.3 < z < 0.6$), 53 low redshift clusters ($z < 0.3$), and also the combination of the low and high redshift datasets. This is one of two surveys to use only *ASCA* data, and has the largest number of high redshift clusters. We assumed a power law relation between the bolometric luminosity of the galaxy cluster and its integrated temperature (uncorrected for cooling flows) and redshift ($L_{bol,44} = CT^\alpha(1+z)^A$). We found that for an $\Omega_M=1.0$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$ universe, $A = 1.134^{+1.057}_{-1.073} \pm 1.66$, $\alpha = 2.815^{+0.322}_{-0.316} \pm 0.42$, and $\log(C) = -1.167^{+0.216}_{-0.221} \pm 0.25$, and for $\Omega_M=0.3$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$, $A = 2.052^{+1.073}_{-1.058} \pm 1.63$, $\alpha = 2.822^{+0.320}_{-0.323} \pm 0.43$, and $\log(C) = -1.126^{+0.223}_{-0.219} \pm 0.26$ (all errors at 68% confidence for one and two interesting parameters, respectively). We found the dispersion at constant kT in this relation to be $\Delta \log L = 0.282$ for $\Omega_M=1.0$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$, and $\Delta \log L = 0.283$ for $\Omega_M=0.3$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$.

The results for the combined dataset and those found using the low and high redshift clusters are consistent, independent of cosmology, with previous estimates of $L \sim T^3$ found by other authors. The observed weak or zero evolution agrees with the predictions of models that produce $L \sim T^3$ incorporating an initial source of non-gravitational energy before cluster collapse.

1. Introduction

Galaxy clusters have three major mass components; the galaxies themselves comprise about 1% of the cluster mass, about 10% of the mass is contained in the hot ($\sim 10^7$ K) X-ray emitting gas of the intracluster medium (ICM), and the rest of the mass is contained in dark matter. The dark matter itself probably exhibits self-similar scaling of its properties down to at the least the sizes of groups of galaxies due to its collisionless properties, and has been modeled with precision (e.g. Navarro, Frenk, & White 1997). The ICM does not have the same scaling properties as the dark matter. Instead it has a core of hot matter which is more extended with respect to self-similar scaling in groups of galaxies and small galaxy clusters than in rich clusters (Ponman et al. 1999).

This break in the self-similar scaling between the hot intracluster medium and the dark matter raises questions about the formation of large structures. The leading explanation for the break is the presence of additional non-gravitational energy in the early stages of galaxy cluster formation, proposed by Kaiser (1991) and Evrard & Henry (1991). This energy produces an initial excess entropy that has a stronger effect on smaller and cooler galaxy clusters than high-mass clusters if the excess entropy is relatively constant for all clusters. There are five reasons to suspect an entropy excess. The first is the difference between the chemical properties and the spatial distribution of the ICM in groups and clusters with ICM temperatures less than about 1 keV and those with ICM temperatures greater than 1 keV (Renzini 1999). Second, the observed mass-temperature (M-T) relation is steeper than the relation predicted by self-similar scaling for clusters of ICM temperatures less than about 3 keV (Horner, Mushotzky, & Scharf 1999, Finoguenov et al. 2001). Third, Ponman et al. (1999) found direct evidence of an entropy floor at low cluster temperature by looking at the entropy of the cluster gas at a fiducial radius as a function of the cluster temperature. Fourth, entropy injection at early epochs is necessary to explain the correlation function and level of the X-ray background (Pen 1999; Wu, Fabian & Nulsen 2000).

The fifth and final reason to suspect a substantial initial entropy is the relation between the bolometric luminosity of galaxy clusters and their temperature (L-T). If the simple scaling laws were applicable, the luminosity would scale as $\sim T^2$ (Kaiser 1986). The observed L-T relation is actually closer to $L \sim T^3$ (Henry & Arnaud 1991, David et al. 1993, Henry 1997, Arnaud & Evrard 1999, Borgani et al. 1999, Riechart et al. 1999, Fairley et al. 2000, Henry 2000). Including an initial entropy in numerical simulations of galaxy cluster formation can produce an L-T relation closer to the observational value (Bialek et al. 2001, Tozzi & Norman 2001).

Initial entropy can be introduced into cluster formation scenarios at different times and from different sources such as star formation or active galactic nuclei (AGN). If the entropy is

not present when the gas is accreted onto the cluster, a much higher level is required to overcome the effects of cooling of high density gas in the cluster core. Wu, Fabian & Nulsen (2000) concluded that the energies required for the initial entropy may be provided by either supernovae or AGN, however, the conditions for which the supernova energy injection is large enough to produce the observed relations are highly contrived. They found that AGN easily produce sufficient energy although the mechanism for using this energy to heat the hot gas is not known. Fujita (2001) found that blast waves driven by quasars are a possible heating mechanism for the intragroup gas prior to falling into the galaxy clusters.

Not all studies have concluded that additional entropy is required to produce the observed scaling laws of L-T and M-T. Muanwong et al. (2001) simulated galaxy cluster formation including radiative cooling with cool gas dropout and were able to reproduce $L \sim T^3$ without adding any entropy to the gas. Voit & Bryan (2001) and Voit et al. (2002) propose a similar mechanism in which radiative cooling with subsequent supernova heating eliminate low-entropy gas. In these models the self-similar scaling is broken because cooling is more efficient at lower temperatures.

The L-T relation has been well studied at low redshift, however, the situation at higher redshift is less clear. Self-similar scaling laws predict that $L \sim T^2(1+z)^{1.5}$ for $\Omega_M=1$ (where Ω_M is the present matter density in units of the critical density), which would indicate a strong positive evolution, but these simple scaling laws are contra-indicated by current observational evidence. Henry et al. (1994), using three redshift bins, found that there is moderate to no evolution out to a redshift of 0.33. Mushotzky & Scharf (1997), using galaxy clusters that had been observed with *ASCA*, found evidence for no evolution out to a redshift of 0.4. Fairley et al. (2000) found that $L \sim T^{3.15}(1+z)^{0.60 \pm 0.38}$ for an $\Omega_M=0.3$ universe, which is consistent with no evolution in the L-T relation out to a redshift of 0.8. Sadat et al. (1999) found some evidence for positive evolution, although their analysis estimates $\Omega_M \sim 0.85$, which is in disagreement with the majority of recent results which indicate an Ω_M of 0.2 to 0.4. Arnaud, Aghanim, & Neumann (2001) used *ASCA* and *ROSAT* data for 25 hot ($kT > 3.5\text{keV}$) clusters, and found that A is positive for a flat universe with $\Omega_M=0.4$.

The L-T relation not only plays an important role in discerning the physics behind the formation of galaxy clusters, as summarized above, but it provides a link between observations of clusters and estimation of cosmological parameters. Cluster number abundance evolution can constrain the shape and amplitude of the mass fluctuation power spectrum as well as the matter density of the universe. When using luminosity to constrain cosmology, it is necessary to modify the mass-luminosity (M-L) relation using the observed L-T relation to incorporate the fact that the luminosities are not given by the self-similar scaling laws. Also, galaxy cluster samples are selected via their X-ray luminosity, but the X-ray temperature is

more directly linked to the cluster mass and hence models of cluster abundance. The L-T relation is used to convert the luminosity selection function to the temperature selection function. These topics are beyond the scope of this paper, but for a complete discussion of the methods, see Henry (2000).

We constructed the L-T relation for a sample of galaxy clusters which have all been observed by *ASCA*. The sample is comprised of all of the clusters of which we are aware with $0.3 < z < 0.6$ that have been observed with *ASCA*, in combination with the clusters in the sample in David et al. 1993 for which there are *ASCA* data available, giving us a total sample of 85 clusters. This sample is not flux limited but is assumed to be representative of galaxy clusters. While data from *Chandra* or *XMM* might be better suited for our purposes, *ASCA* data are the only ones available for a sufficiently large number of clusters to conduct a statistically relevant uniform study. The *ASCA* satellite has two high-quality spectroscopic instruments covering an energy range similar to the typical temperature range of galaxy clusters ($kT \sim 2-10$ keV). Many of the previous studies have used *ROSAT* data alone or in combination with *ASCA* data. *ROSAT* is only sensitive to a small range of energies (0.1–2.4 keV) which are less than the average cluster temperature. Using only *ASCA* data gave us a sample which is uniform and allows us to do high precision statistical analysis. The sample most similar to ours is the *ASCA* Cluster Catalogue, which contains 273 galaxy clusters and groups all observed with *ASCA* (Horner 2001). This work used both pointed and serendipitous observations of clusters and explored the L-T, M-T, and optical velocity dispersion (σ)-T relation out to a redshift of about 0.5.

We examined the slope of the L-T relation at low redshift ($z < 0.3$, 53 clusters), high redshift ($0.3 < z < 0.6$, 32 clusters), and for the dataset as a whole. We investigated whether the L-T relation evolves with redshift for two different cosmologies thereby testing the prediction of little to no evolution out to $z \sim 1$ if there was a significant source of non-gravitational energy available during the early stages of cluster formation (Bialek et al. 2001, Tozzi & Norman 2001, Bower et al. 2001). We assumed a Hubble constant of $50 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ throughout.

2. Data

For the $z \geq 0.3$ clusters, we determined the integrated temperature, uncorrected for cooling flows, and luminosity of the high redshift clusters using *ftools* and *XSPEC*. Cooling flow corrections are generally not possible with *ASCA* for clusters at these redshifts because of the spatial resolution of the observations. The *ASCA* Gas Imaging Spectrometers (GIS) were operated in the normal PH mode and the Solid-State Imaging Spectrometers (SIS) were operated in either FAINT or BRIGHT mode, usually with two CCD chips active. Data

were screened and discarded when the X-ray telescopes (XRTs) were less than 10° from the Earth, the geomagnetic rigidity was smaller than 6 GeV, and the XRT for the SIS-0 and SIS-1 were less than 40° to 20° respectively from the sunlit Earth. Background was acquired from the same exposures, usually from annuli surrounding the cluster.

Source counts were accumulated from 6.125' and 2.5' radii regions for the GIS and SIS respectively. The different size regions reflect the different spatial resolutions of the two instruments. The source spectra were grouped until each bin contained at least 20 counts, the background was grouped with the same binning and subtracted, and the net spectra from the four detectors were simultaneously fitted with *XSPEC* 10. The adjustable parameters were the GIS and SIS normalizations, temperature, abundance, and hydrogen column density for the SIS. The fixed parameters were the redshift and hydrogen column density for the GIS. The total flux and luminosity were determined from the GIS normalization, assuming the clusters are point sources. Our temperature and luminosity measurements were usually in excellent agreement with the values reported by others.

We used two different cosmologies for our analysis: the canonical matter-dominated cosmology with the present ratio of the density of matter in the universe to the critical density required to close the universe, Ω_M , equal to one and $\Omega_\Lambda \equiv \frac{\Lambda}{3H_0^2} = 0$ where Λ is the cosmological constant and H_0 is the present Hubble constant. The other is a cosmology with $\Omega_M=0.3$ and $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$, which is consistent with the results from high redshift type Ia supernovae (Perlmutter et al. 1999, Schmidt et al. 1998) and many CMB results (e.g. Melchiorri et al. 2000). We converted the X-Ray band luminosities into bolometric luminosities using bolometric corrections derived with *XSPEC*. The properties of the high redshift clusters are listed in Table 1, where we include the luminosities and their errors for both cosmologies. The mean redshift of the high redshift clusters is 0.34.

For the $z < 0.3$ clusters, we used the luminosities as published by White, Jones, & Forman (1997). White (2000) used *ASCA* data to determine the integrated non-cooling flow corrected temperatures of the clusters in the low redshift portion of our sample, and we use these values in our analysis. We have listed these clusters and their properties in Table 2. The published luminosities are for $\Omega_M=1.0$ and $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$, which we converted to luminosities for the $\Omega_M=0.3$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$ cosmology by using the ratio of their luminosity distances:

$$L_i = \frac{d_{L_i}^2}{d_{L_j}^2} L_j \quad (1)$$

$$d_L = (1+z) \int_0^z \frac{c}{H_0} dz' [\Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_M(1+z')^3]^{-0.5} \quad (2)$$

The mean redshift of the low redshift clusters is 0.05; the mean redshift of all the clusters in the dataset is 0.179.

3. Analysis

We devised a number of tests to examine how galaxy cluster luminosity scales with temperature, and whether or not the L-T relation has any redshift dependence. We assumed that the luminosity goes as a power law in temperature, as well as a power law in $(1+z)$. There is some intrinsic scatter in this relation. Many authors have used the BCES method (Akritas & Bershady, 1996), which includes errors on all variables and allows for intrinsic scatter, to measure the slopes and scatter in the same relations (Markevitch 1998, & Ikebe et al. 2001). Our method from *Numerical Recipes* seems equivalent as we obtained nearly identical results for the temperature exponent.

We adopted the following form for the L-T relation:

$$L_{bol,44} = C * T^\alpha * (1 + z)^A. \quad (3)$$

Taking the logarithm of this equation, we found that:

$$\log(L_{bol,44}) = \log(C) + \alpha \log(T) + A \log(1 + z). \quad (4)$$

For our analysis of these data, we included the errors on both the luminosity and the temperature, and we assumed that our redshifts do not contribute any error. The discussion in *Numerical Recipes* (Press et al. 1988) describes how χ^2 is related to the errors on each of the quantities, $\epsilon_L = \sigma(\log L) = 0.4343\sigma_L/L$ and $\epsilon_T = \sigma(\log T) = 0.4343\sigma_T/T$, where σ_L and σ_T are the measured errors on the luminosity and temperature. The temperature errors were symmetrized by using the average of the plus and minus errors. This discussion lead us to the following expression for χ^2 :

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\log(L_{bol,44,i}) - \log(C) - \alpha \log(T_i) - A \log(1 + z_i))^2}{\epsilon_{L_i}^2 + \alpha^2 \epsilon_{T_i}^2} \quad (5)$$

where N is the number of clusters.

By setting the derivative of χ^2 with respect to $\log(C)$ equal to zero, the value of $\log(C)$ at the minimum χ^2 can be expressed as a function of the other two parameters, A and α :

$$\log(C) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (\log(L_{bol,44,i}) - \alpha \log(T_i) - A \log(1 + z_i)) (\epsilon_{L_i}^2 + \alpha^2 \epsilon_{T_i}^2)^{-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^N (\epsilon_{L_i}^2 + \alpha^2 \epsilon_{T_i}^2)^{-1}} \quad (6)$$

Substituting equation (6) into equation (5), we obtained an expression for χ^2 in terms of A and α . We performed a grid search of χ^2 to find the minimum with respect to A and α and solved for $\log(C)$ for the particular dataset. The results for each dataset are given in Tables 3, 4, and 5. We found the best fit values for each of the parameters for the two cosmologies

for two different scenarios. In one scenario we solved for A , and in the other scenario we set $A=0$ and fit for only α . In this way we can look at the L-T relation independent of the redshift of the galaxy clusters. Table 3 contains the results of these calculations for the combined sample and Tables 4 and 5 contain the results we obtained with the low and high redshift samples individually. Figures 1-3 show a plot of our data with the best fits overlaid for both the $A=0$ case and the case where we fit for A . Figures 2 and 3 show the best fits to the low or high redshift data as well as the best fit found using the combined sample for comparison.

4. Error Analysis

4.1. Errors on the Parameters

As there is intrinsic scatter in the data (see section 4.2 below), χ^2 is quite large, so we resorted to numerical methods to estimate the error on each of the parameters. We simulated 10,000 datasets using the bootstrap method. The random datasets were created by randomly drawing N data points from the original dataset. After each random draw, we put that point back into the original dataset so that it could possibly be drawn again. This scenario is likely to produce a dataset which has a few clusters included more than once and others which may be excluded. We then ran our χ^2 minimization routine on each of the random datasets to fit our parameters. To estimate $1-\sigma$ errors on the parameters, we found the 16% and 84% confidence levels for each from the corresponding points of the cumulative distributions of each parameter as shown in figures 4-6. These errors are included in Tables 3, 4 and 5 and are for the case of one interesting parameter. In figures 7-9 we plot A vs. α for each of our Montecarlo simulations. The ellipses shown are the smallest area encompassing 68% and 95% of the points, found using a grid search algorithm. They are the errors for the case of two interesting parameters, also listed in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

In summary, we found that for $\Omega_M=1.0$, $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$:

$$\log(L_{bol,44}) = (2.815_{-0.316}^{+0.322} \pm 0.42) \log(T) + (1.134_{-1.073}^{+1.057} \pm 1.66) \log(1+z) + (-1.167_{-0.221}^{+0.216} \pm 0.25), \quad (7)$$

and that for $\Omega_M=0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$:

$$\log(L_{bol,44}) = (2.822_{-0.323}^{+0.320} \pm 0.43) \log(T) + (2.052_{-1.058}^{+1.073} \pm 1.63) \log(1+z) + (-1.126_{-0.219}^{+0.223} \pm 0.26). \quad (8)$$

where the errors are 68% confidence for one or two interesting parameters respectively.

4.2. Characterization of the Intrinsic Scatter in the L-T Relation

To estimate the dispersion in the L-T relation, we compared our luminosity data with the calculated luminosities based on the temperatures of the clusters and equation 7 or 8. We calculated two quantities: the difference between the predicted and measured luminosity in linear space (ΔL) and in log space ($\Delta \log L$). The mean and standard deviation of these differences for ΔL and $\Delta \log L$ for each of our sets of parameters are listed in Tables 6 and 7. The distribution of ΔL is non-gaussian, as shown in Figure 10, while the distribution of $\Delta \log L$ is approximately gaussian in nature as shown in Figure 11. Over each of the histograms, we plotted a lognormal distribution:

$$f(x; \mu, \sigma) = (stepsize) * (N) \left[\frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \frac{-(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \quad (9)$$

where x is either ΔL (Figure 10) or $\Delta \log L$ (Figure 11), and μ and σ are the corresponding mean and standard deviation. The stepsize is the size of the bins in the histogram. For the latter case, the distribution is lognormal.

The standard deviations in $\Delta \log L$ are very similar for all cases. For A non-zero, we measured a standard deviation of 0.282 for $\Omega_M=1.0$, $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$, and 0.283 for $\Omega_M=0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$. Markevitch (1998) measured a $\Delta \log L=0.181$ for a sample of clusters with *ASCA* and *ROSAT* data without cooling flow corrections, which is somewhat lower than our measurements. Ikebe et al. (2001), using a flux limited sample of galaxy clusters with *ROSAT* and *ASCA* data and correcting for cooling flows, measured $\Delta \log L=0.24$. This $\Delta \log L$ was measured with their α value of 2.47 (significantly lower than our average value) and including galaxy clusters down to a temperature of 1.4keV.

5. Conclusions

Previous studies at both low and high redshift have found $\alpha \simeq 3$ (see earlier references). We found $\alpha=3$ within 1.52σ for all of our data, independent of cosmology. Borgani et al. (1999), using the X-Ray Luminosity Function (XLF) from the Rosat Deep Cluster Survey (Rosati et al. 1998) and the Brightest Cluster Survey (Ebeling et al. 1997), constrained α to be between 3 and 4. Using their XLF and constraints on α , they found $1 \leq A \leq 3$ for an $\Omega_M=1.0$ universe and $A=0$ implied a low density universe. Mushotzky & Scharf (1997) found $A=0$. Donahue et al. (1999) found a slightly negative value of A (for $\Omega_M=1.0$, $A=-1.4^{+0.8}_{-1.6}$, and for $\Omega_M=0.3$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$, $A=-0.8^{+0.9}_{-1.1}$, as read from their figure 7), and rule out $A=1.5$; their results were also consistent with $A=0$. Reichart, Castander and Nichol (1999) determined the L-T relation for cooling flow corrected luminosities and temperatures. They found $\alpha = 2.80 \pm 0.15$

and $A = 0.35^{+0.54}_{-1.22}$ or $1.53^{+0.54}_{-1.22}$ for $\Omega_M=1$, $\Omega_\Lambda=0$ or $\Omega_M=0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$ respectively. These results agree with ours. Horner (2001) found for $L_{bol} > 2 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ that $\alpha = 2.98 \pm 0.14$ and $A = 0.02 \pm 0.16$ for no cooling flow corrections and $\Omega_M=1.0$ (his equation 5.7), again consistent with our results.

The A parameter is closely related to the duration and heating epoch of the ICM in the non-gravitational heating models (Cavaliere et al. 1997). Bialek et al. (2001) found that a model using nonzero initial entropy yielded an α consistent with observations. A consequence of this model is that A is approximately zero out to a redshift of 0.5. Tozzi & Norman (2001) included cooling and shocks in their model with an initial entropy, and they predicted A to be zero or only slightly positive out to a redshift of one. They found that changing cosmology does not have a strong effect on the value of A . The evolution expected in the cooling/drop out models has not yet been determined. Obviously if the evolution is different from the heating models then we may be able to discriminate between them.

Our results indicate that the value of A for the matter-dominated $\Omega_M=1.0$ cosmology is smaller than for the $\Omega_M=0.3$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$ case, but that both results are consistent with zero. We conclude that our results are consistent with weak or no evolution of the L-T relation, and agree with the heating models mentioned above.

This work was supported by NASA grant NAG5-9166. M. Sornig thanks the Institute for Astronomy for its hospitality during a visiting studentship.

REFERENCES

- Arnaud, M., Aghanim, N., & Neumann, D.M. astro-ph/0110428
- Arnaud, M., & Evrard, A.E. 1999, 305, 631
- Bialek, J., Evrard, A.E., & Mohr, J. 2001, ApJ, 555, 597
- Borgani, S., Rosati, P., Tozzi, P., & Norman, C. 1999, ApJ, 517, 40
- Bower, R.G., Benson, A.J., Lacey, C.G., Baugh, C.M., Cole, S., & Frenk, C.S. 2001, MNRAS, 325, 497
- Cavaliere, A., Menci, N., & Tozzi, P. 1997, ApJ, 484, L21
- David, L.P., Slyz, A., Jones, C., Forman, W., & Vrtilek, S.D. 1993, ApJ, 412, 479

- Donahue, M., Voit, G. M., Scharf, C. A., Gioia, I. M., Mullis, C. R., Hughes, J. P., & Stocke, J. T. 1999, *ApJ*, 527, 525
- Evrard, A.E. & Henry, J.P. 1991, *ApJ*, 383, 95
- Fairley, B.W., Jones, L.R., Scharf, C., Ebeling, H., Perlman, E., Horner, D., Wegner, G., & Malkan, M. 2000, *MNRAS*, 315, 669
- Finoguenov, A., Reiprich, T.H., Böringer, H. 2001, *A&A*, 368, 749
- Fujita, Y. 2001, *ApJ*, 550, L7
- Henry, J.P. 1997, *ApJ*, 489, L1
- Henry, J.P. 2000, *ApJ*, 534, 565
- Henry, J.P. & Arnaud, K.A. 1991, *ApJ*, 372, 410
- Henry, J.P., Jiao, L., & Gioia, I.M. 1994, *ApJ*, 432, 49
- Horner, D.J. 2001, PhD thesis, University of Maryland
- Horner, D.J., Mushotzsky, R.F., & Scharf, C.A. 1999, *ApJ*, 520, 78
- Ikebe, Y., Reiprich, T.H., Böringer, H., Tanaka, Y., & Kitayama, T. 2001 *astro-ph/0112315*
- Kaiser, N. 1986, *MNRAS*, 222, 323
- Kaiser, N. 1991, *ApJ*, 383, 104
- Markevitch, M. 1998 *ApJ*, 504, 27
- Melchiorri, A., Ade, P.A.R., de Bernardis, P. et al. 2000, *ApJ*, 536, L63
- Muanwong, O., Thomas, P.A., Kay, S.T., Pearce, F.R., & Couchman, H.M.P. 2001, *ApJ*, 552, L27
- Mushotzky, R.F., & Scharf, C.A. 1999, *ApJ*, 482, L13
- Navarro, J.F., Frenk, C.S., & White, S.D.M. 1997, *ApJ*, 490, 493
- Neumann, D.M. & Arnaud, M. 1999, *A&A*, 348, 711
- Neumann, D.M. & Arnaud, M. 2001, *A&A*, 373, L33
- Pen, U.-L., 1999, *ApJ*, 510, L1

- Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., The Supernova Cosmology Project, et al. 1999, ApJ, 517, 565
- Ponman, T.J., Cannon, D.B., & Navarro, J.F. 1999, Nature, 397, 135
- Press, T.L., Flannery, Teukolsky, & Vetterling 1988, *Numerical Recipes in C*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Reichart, D.E., Castander, F.J., & Nichol, R.C. 1999, ApJ, 516, 1
- Renzini, A. 1999 in Chemical Evolution from Zero to High Redshift, ed. J.R. Walsh, & M.R. Rosa (Berlin:Springer), 185
- Schmidt, B.P., Suntzeff, N.B., Phillips, M.M. 1998, ApJ, 507, 46
- Sadat, R., Blanchard, A., & Oukbir, J. 1998, A&A, 329, 21
- Tozzi, P., & Norman, C. 2001, ApJ, 546, 63
- Voit, G.M. & Bryan, G.L. 2001, Nature, 414, 424
- Voit, G.M., Bryan, G.L, Balough, M.L., & Bower, R.G. 2002, astro-ph/0205240
- White, D.A. 2000, MNRAS, 312, 663
- White, D.A., Jones, C., & Forman, W. 1997, MNRAS, 292, 419
- Wu, K.K.S., Fabian, A.C., & Nulsen, P.E.J. 2001, MNRAS, 324, 95

Table 1. Clusters with $z > 0.3$

Cluster	Redshift	kT(keV)	$+\sigma_T$ (keV)	$-\sigma_T$ (keV)	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=1.0$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=0.3$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
A370	0.3730	7.04	0.520	0.500	28.72	0.631	38.685	0.850
A1722	0.3280	6.22	0.280	0.470	21.96	0.380	28.770	0.498
AC118	0.3080	10.61	0.490	0.480	62.16	0.524	80.389	0.678
A1995	0.3120	10.37	1.350	1.190	30.20	0.633	39.159	0.821
AC114	0.3120	8.81	0.620	0.610	31.74	0.532	41.155	0.690
A1576	0.3020	8.65	0.670	0.660	29.80	0.510	38.387	0.658
A959	0.3530	7.53	0.900	0.750	22.10	0.609	29.410	0.810
CL2244	0.3280	7.12	1.680	1.310	7.68	0.442	10.061	0.579
CL0500	0.3160	5.56	2.090	1.250	4.39	0.194	5.707	0.252
3C295	0.4599	7.29	1.640	0.440	25.64	0.841	36.264	1.189
A851	0.4069	8.52	0.970	0.920	18.35	0.488	25.210	0.670
CL2236	0.5520	5.51	1.610	1.120	10.40	0.904	15.396	1.339
RXJ1347	0.4510	11.16	0.490	0.480	197.52	1.815	278.043	2.554
MS2137.5	0.3130	4.85	0.290	0.290	33.98	0.711	44.089	0.922
MS1358.5	0.3290	6.92	0.510	0.490	21.36	0.652	28.001	0.855
MS0353.6	0.3200	6.46	0.980	0.800	14.31	0.528	18.651	0.688
MS1008.1	0.3060	8.21	1.150	1.050	18.30	0.592	23.635	0.765
MS1224.7	0.3260	4.09	0.650	0.520	7.09	0.403	9.277	0.527
MS1512.4	0.3730	3.39	0.400	0.350	9.59	0.606	12.917	0.816
MS1426.4	0.3200	6.38	0.980	1.200	9.62	0.422	12.539	0.550
MS1147.3	0.3030	5.96	0.990	0.690	8.68	0.318	11.189	0.409
MS0811.6	0.3120	4.87	0.950	0.630	5.69	0.333	7.378	0.432
MS1241.5	0.5490	6.09	1.380	1.140	22.59	1.270	33.396	1.878
MS0451.6	0.5392	10.27	0.850	0.800	66.51	1.239	97.873	1.823
MS0015.9	0.5466	8.92	0.570	0.560	72.62	1.237	107.237	1.827
MS0302.7	0.4246	4.35	0.800	0.640	11.18	0.741	15.513	1.028
MS1621.5	0.4274	6.59	0.920	0.810	15.93	0.612	22.138	0.850
MS2053.7	0.5830	8.14	3.680	2.150	13.88	1.100	20.840	1.652
CL0024	0.3901	5.11	1.210	0.950	5.80	0.637	7.892	0.867

Table 1—Continued

Cluster	Redshift	kT(keV)	$+\sigma_T$ (keV)	$-\sigma_T$ (keV)	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=1.0$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=0.3$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
MS0418.3	0.3500	7.02	1.350	1.390	5.60	0.253	7.438	0.336
MS0821.5	0.3470	5.90	1.560	1.470	3.26	0.277	4.322	0.367
MS1532.5	0.3200	4.12	0.710	0.570	3.89	0.258	5.070	0.336

Table 2. Clusters with $z < 0.3$

Cluster	Redshift	kT(keV)	$+\sigma_T$ (keV)	$-\sigma_T$ (keV)	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=1.0$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=0.3$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
A85	0.0521	5.92	0.11	0.11	16.511	0.098	17.401	0.103
A119	0.0443	5.62	0.12	0.12	5.781	0.147	6.047	0.154
A262	0.0163	2.21	0.03	0.03	0.915	0.030	0.931	0.031
A399	0.0715	6.80	0.17	0.17	8.774	0.147	9.419	0.158
A400	0.0238	2.26	0.04	0.04	0.756	0.065	0.775	0.067
A401	0.0748	8.68	0.17	0.17	19.317	0.214	20.802	0.230
A426	0.0179	5.28	0.03	0.03	21.434	1.031	21.835	1.050
A478	0.0881	6.58	0.26	0.25	47.909	1.126	52.230	1.228
A496	0.0330	4.08	0.04	0.04	5.808	0.212	6.007	0.219
A539	0.0288	2.89	0.05	0.05	1.299	0.028	1.338	0.029
A548S	0.0415	3.10	0.10	0.10	1.174	0.026	1.225	0.027
A576	0.0381	4.02	0.07	0.07	2.761	0.096	2.870	0.100
A644	0.0704	7.47	0.12	0.10	14.652	0.148	15.714	0.159
A665	0.1816	7.73	0.41	0.35	25.395	0.719	29.980	0.849
A754	0.0542	9.83	0.27	0.27	23.125	0.491	24.421	0.519
A1060	0.0124	3.19	0.03	0.03	0.781	0.018	0.791	0.018
A1367	0.0214	3.64	0.10	0.10	1.760	0.052	1.799	0.053
A1413	0.1427	7.32	0.26	0.24	23.623	1.060	27.016	1.212
A1650	0.0840	6.11	0.15	0.14	13.297	0.306	14.442	0.332
A1656	0.0231	8.67	0.17	0.17	15.563	0.830	15.938	0.850
A1689	0.1810	9.23	0.28	0.28	50.456	1.056	59.536	1.246
A1775	0.0696	3.69	0.20	0.11	4.683	0.149	5.019	0.160
A1795	0.0621	5.80	0.07	0.07	20.146	0.292	21.437	0.311
A2052	0.0348	3.03	0.04	0.03	3.645	0.119	3.777	0.123
A2063	0.0355	3.52	0.09	0.09	3.642	0.066	3.776	0.068
A2065	0.0722	5.42	0.13	0.13	11.283	0.309	12.121	0.332
A2107	0.0421	3.93	0.10	0.10	2.714	0.096	2.833	0.100
A2142	0.0899	9.02	0.32	0.32	58.593	0.736	63.983	0.804
A2147	0.0356	4.50	0.07	0.07	4.231	0.232	4.388	0.241
A2199	0.0299	4.27	0.04	0.04	6.295	0.075	6.491	0.077
A2218	0.1710	6.84	0.34	0.04	18.093	0.750	21.179	0.878
A2255	0.0808	6.87	0.20	0.20	9.721	0.127	10.527	0.138
A2256	0.0581	6.96	0.11	0.11	15.777	0.115	16.724	0.122
A2319	0.0559	9.73	0.27	0.27	28.515	0.231	30.163	0.244
A2634	0.0309	3.27	0.07	0.07	1.204	0.022	1.243	0.023
A2657	0.0414	3.81	0.07	0.07	2.932	0.040	3.058	0.042
A2670	0.0759	3.73	0.17	0.13	3.885	0.178	4.188	0.192

Table 2—Continued

Cluster	Redshift	kT(keV)	$+\sigma_T$ (keV)	$-\sigma_T$ (keV)	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=1.0$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.0$	$L_{bol,44}$ $\Omega_M=0.3$	$\sigma_{L_{bol,44}}$ $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
A3112	0.0746	4.45	0.07	0.07	11.596	0.765	12.485	0.824
A3158	0.0575	5.77	0.10	0.05	6.970	0.137	7.384	0.145
A3266	0.0594	8.34	0.17	0.16	16.270	0.148	17.268	0.157
A3391	0.0531	5.60	0.17	0.17	3.372	0.071	3.557	0.075
A3562	0.0499	3.42	0.16	0.16	9.908	0.421	10.420	0.443
A3571	0.0390	7.24	0.09	0.09	17.157	0.238	17.852	0.248
A3667	0.0542	7.13	0.14	0.14	12.574	0.139	13.279	0.147
A4059	0.0478	3.90	0.07	0.07	4.936	0.179	5.180	0.188
AWM4	0.0424	2.38	0.06	0.06	1.673	0.022	1.747	0.023
AWM7	0.0176	3.79	0.05	0.05	3.119	0.041	3.176	0.042
CYG-A	0.0570	9.49	0.23	0.23	10.685	0.153	11.314	0.162
MKW3S	0.0434	3.41	0.05	0.05	4.259	0.110	4.451	0.115
MKW4	0.0196	1.93	0.09	0.08	0.445	0.007	0.454	0.007
OPH	0.0280	12.75	0.29	0.29	31.410	2.761	32.326	2.842
PKS0745	0.1028	7.21	0.11	0.11	51.175	4.360	56.537	4.817
2A0336	0.0350	3.08	0.03	0.03	7.067	0.156	7.324	0.162

Table 3. Combined Dataset Results

A		68%	68%	α		68%	68%	log(C)		68%	68%	Cosmology
c ¹	mc ²	1-par	2-par	c ¹	mc ²	1-par	2-par	c ¹	mc ²	1-par	2-par	
1.134	1.146	^{+1.057} _{-1.073}	± 1.66	2.815	2.855	^{+0.322} _{-0.316}	± 0.42	-1.167	-1.167	^{+0.216} _{-0.221}	± 0.25	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
0	...	...	...	2.910	2.948	^{+0.283} _{-0.289}	...	-1.162	-1.203	^{+0.213} _{-0.208}	...	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
2.052	2.065	^{+1.073} _{-1.058}	± 1.63	2.822	2.862	^{+0.320} _{-0.323}	± 0.43	-1.126	-1.169	^{+0.223} _{-0.219}	± 0.26	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
0	...	...	...	3.003	3.040	^{+0.290} _{-0.297}	...	-1.201	-1.242	^{+0.220} _{-0.215}	...	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$

¹c = the χ^2 minimum.

²mc = the mean of the Montecarlo parameter estimates.

Table 4. Individual Dataset Results: $z < 0.3$

A		68%	68%	α		68%	68%	log(C)		68%	68%	Cosmology
c^1	mc ²	1-par	2-par	c^1	mc ²	1-par	2-par	c^1	mc ²	1-par	2-par	
0.021	0.176	$+3.584$ -3.572	± 5.47	2.841	2.863	$+0.354$ -0.353	± 0.49	-1.120	-1.154	$+0.225$ -0.225	± 0.26	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
0	...	...	...	2.842	2.864	$+0.305$ -0.307	...	-1.120	-1.151	$+0.224$ -0.220	...	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
1.012	1.044	$+3.467$ -3.700	± 4.89	2.845	2.867	$+0.357$ -0.348	± 0.55	-1.122	-1.156	$+0.224$ -0.228	± 0.30	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
0	...	...	...	2.896	2.918	$+0.315$ -0.316	...	-1.136	-1.167	$+0.231$ -0.227	...	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$

¹c = the χ^2 minimum.

²mc = the mean of the Montecarlo parameter estimates.

Table 5. **Individual Dataset Results: $0.3 < z < 0.6$**

A		68%	68%	α		68%	68%	log(C)		68%	68%	Cosmology
c^1	mc ²	1-par	2-par	c^1	mc ²	1-par	2-par	c^1	mc ²	1-par	2-par	
1.385	0.251	$^{+3.260}_{-3.634}$	± 4.79	3.809	4.082	$^{+0.912}_{-0.655}$	± 1.17	-2.023	-2.097	$^{+0.484}_{-0.618}$	± 0.75	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
0	...	...	...	3.960	4.009	$^{+0.683}_{-0.529}$	...	-1.967	-2.015	$^{+0.491}_{-0.587}$	...	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
2.181	1.169	$^{+3.382}_{-3.512}$	± 4.76	3.810	4.083	$^{+0.914}_{-0.622}$	± 1.19	-2.005	-2.079	$^{+0.470}_{-0.618}$	± 0.84	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
0	...	...	...	4.068	4.108	$^{+0.553}_{-0.695}$	...	-1.934	-1.975	$^{+0.596}_{-0.509}$	...	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$

¹c = the χ^2 minimum.

²mc = the mean of the Montecarlo parameter estimates.

Table 6. **Difference of ΔL from the L-T Relation**

A	α	$\log(C)$	mean	standard deviation	Cosmology
1.134	2.815	−1.167	−1.034	19.66	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
0	2.910	−1.162	0.9185	19.74	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
2.053	2.822	−1.126	−5.182	27.77	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
0	3.003	−1.202	2.745	28.29	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$

Table 7. **Difference of $\Delta\log(L)$ from the L-T Relation**

A	α	$\log(C)$	mean	standard deviation	Cosmology
1.134	2.815	−1.167	0.0690	0.282	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
0	2.910	−1.162	0.0254	0.285	$\Omega_M=1.0 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.0$
2.053	2.822	−1.126	0.0691	0.283	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$
0	3.003	−1.202	−0.0083	0.298	$\Omega_M=0.3 \ \Omega_\Lambda=0.7$

This figure "Novicki.fig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig4.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig5.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig6.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig7.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig8.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig9.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig10.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>

This figure "Novicki.fig11.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0208468v1>